

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 12-17, 25, 27-31 remain in the application. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowed claim 9, and to correct for informailities in the claim, as well as to overcome a section 112 rejection. Independent claims 12 and 25 have been amended to include the limitations of wherein the bridge structure is disposed across the opening of the pore Support for this amendment can be found in Figure 3c of the present application, for example. Claims 27-30 have been amended to overcome section 112 rejections, as described below. No new subject matter has been added with these amendments.

#### A. Claim Objections

Claim 1 has been objected to for informalities. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the informalities. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to these claims is respectfully requested.

#### B. 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 has been rejected under paragraph 1 of 35 U.S.C. section 112. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 112 rejection to claim 1 is respectfully requested. Claims 27-30 have been amended to overcome the section 112 rejection, thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 112 rejection to claims 27-30 is respectfully requested

#### C. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Ivanov, Kajiura in view of Nie, Fleckstein-Claims 12-16, 25, 27-30

The Office contends it would have been obvious to use the silane coupling agent in Nie , Flekstein to seal the pores of Ivanov/Kajiura (to which the Applicants do not concede).

However, the seal poring method of Nie discloses modifying a quantum dot (QD) disposed within the pore with the sulfur containing silane compound before sealing the pore. There is no disclosure of a method of utilizing a sulfur containing silane compound to seal the pore without first modifying the QD disposed in the pore, either before placing the QD in the pore or after the QD is placed in the pore. Therefore, there would be no suggestion or motivation, either in Nie or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the Nie reference or combine the reference teachings to seal a pore without first coating a QD located within the pore.

Additionally, Nie, Fleckstein nor Ivanov/Kajiura do not disclose the barrier comprising the bridge structure disposed across the opening of the pore, as in amended claims 12 and 25 of the present application. The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination

and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

Because Ivanov/Kajiura, nor Nie, Fleckstein, either alone or in combination, suggest or motivate, nor teach all of the limitations of claim 12 and 25 (from which claims 13-16 and 27-30 depend), these claims are not rendered obvious by Ivanov/Kajiura, in view of Nie, Fleckstein. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 12-16, 25, 27-30 is respectfully requested.

Ivanov in view of Kajiura, Nie and Fleckenstein, Cottle -Claims 17, 31

The Office contends it would have been obvious to use the aldehyde of Cottle in the inventions of Ivanov/Kajiura, Nie, Fleckenstein (to which the Applicants do not concede).

However, independent claims 12 and 25 have been amended to include the limitations described above. "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." In *re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Because neither Ivanov/Kajiura and Fleckenstein, Nie, Cottle, either alone or in combination, teach or even suggest the limitations of amended claims 12 and 25, claims 12 and 25 (and claims 17 and 31 which dependent on claims 12 and 25 respectively) are not rendered obvious by Ivanov/Kajiura and Fleckenstein, Nie, Cottle. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 17, 31 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants request allowance of the application. Please forward further communications to the address of record. If the Examiner needs to contact the below-signed Attorney to further the prosecution of the application, the contact number is (480) 715-5488.

Respectfully submitted,

**Customer Number: 59796**

Dated: June 16, 2008

/Kathy J. Ortiz/

Kathy J. Ortiz

Reg. No. 54,351

Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited via facsimile addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 16 day of June 2008.

Kyrstin Ryan

Name

/Kyrstin Ryan/

Signature